UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,959	07/28/2003	Eitan Hefetz	34874-020 UTIL	6174

64280 7590 01/17/2007

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.
9255 TOWNE CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 600
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER	
PATEL, MANGLESH M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/628,959	HEFETZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manglesh M. Patel	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Amendment (September 27, 2006)*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This **Non-Final** action is responsive to the amendment filed on September 27. 2006.

2. Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 18 and 21 are independent claims.

Withdrawn Rejections

3. The 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejections of claims 1-22 with cited reference of Lynch U.S. 6,558,431 have been withdrawn in view of the persuasive arguments and newly cited art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu (U.S. Pub 2004/0090458, filed Nov 12, 2002).

Regarding Independent claim 1, Yu discloses a method comprising:

- Providing a design-time translator and a run-time translator that both correspond to a defined page element (paragraph 13 & 16, wherein the design-time translator includes the WYSIWYG HTML editor pertaining to the graphical layouts that include page elements. Wherein the run-time translator is when the page is previewed without any editor and allows the scripts to be viewed);
- During design-time for a page, invoking the design-time translator for a page template including the defined page element having one or more content components, said design-time invoking resulting in the defined page element in the page template being translated into a representation of the one or more content components in the page (paragraph 13, wherein the page elements are displayed in the WYSIWYG editor this is the process of translating the code in the editor into a representation of one or more content components in the page);

- During run-time for the page, invoking the run-time translator for the page template, said run-time invoking resulting in the one or more content components being obtained and the defined page element in the page template being translated into a presentation of the obtained one or more content components (paragraph 16, wherein the run-time translator is the previewing which allows the scripting code to be displayed without any editing features). Yu describes during run-time previewing of the script, however the components are obtained based on a predetermined set of rules therefore avoiding accessing the components from a server. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that the components pertaining to scripts are normally extracted from servers. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow access of dynamic content from multiple server locations and avoiding querying instructions in the local machine for handling the scripts thereby improving the performance of local machines rendering the scripts during run-time.

Regarding Dependent claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Yu discloses wherein said invoking the design-time translator further results in presentation of a WYSIWYG layout editor using the representation of the one or more content components in the page (paragraph 13, wherein the page elements are displayed in the WYSIWYG editor this is the process of translating the code in the editor into a representation of one or more content components in the page).

Regarding Dependent claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Yu discloses wherein the said invoking the design-time translator further results in client-side scripting components being included in the representation to form at least part of the WYSIWYG layout editor and enable adding a content component to a content container using a drag-and-drop action (paragraph 13).

Regarding Dependent claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Yu discloses wherein the page template comprises a portal page template, and the WYSIWYG layout editor comprises a WYSIWYG portal page layout editor (paragraph 13).

Regarding Dependent claim 5, which depends on claim 4, Yu discloses wherein the defined page element comprises a custom Java Server Page tag and the design-time translator and the run-time translator comprise Java Server Page tag handlers for the custom Java Server Page tag, and wherein the run-time translator obtains portal dynamic content according to the portal page template and the design-time translator does not (paragraph 13).

Regarding Independent claim 6, Yu discloses an article comprising a machine-readable medium storing instructions operable to cause one or more machines to perform operations comprising:

- During design-time of a portal page, translating a placeholder in a portal template into a representation of a container designed to present portal dynamic content associated with the placeholder, and presenting a WYSIWYG portal layout editor using the representation of the container designed to present the portal dynamic content (paragraphs 13 & 14, wherein a placeholder represents the scripts for the dynamic content in the WYSIWYG editor during design-time);
- During run-time of a portal page, obtaining the portal dynamic content from a dynamic content source, and translating the placeholder in the portal template into a presentation of the container and the obtained portal dynamic content (paragraph 16, wherein the run-time translator is the previewing which allows the scripting code to be displayed without any editing features. Further the previewing allows the presentation of the container including obtained dynamic content based on the predetermined set of rules). Yu describes during run-time previewing of the script, however the components are obtained based on a predetermined set of rules therefore avoiding accessing the components from a server. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that the components pertaining to scripts are normally extracted from servers. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow access of dynamic content from multiple server locations and avoiding querying instructions in the local machine for handling the scripts thereby improving the performance of local machines rendering the scripts during run-time.

Regarding Dependent claim 7, which depends on claim 6, Yu discloses wherein translating the placeholder during design-time comprises adding code enabling editing of the portal page, the added code forming at least part of the WYSIWYG portal layout editor (paragraphs 13 & 14, wherein a placeholder represents the scripts for the dynamic content in the WYSIWYG editor during design-time). Yu doesn't explicitly describe the rendering of the content based on the scripts in WYSIWYG editor that would include static content. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the rendering of the scripts to only show static content within the WYSIWYG editor. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow some static content associated with the script and placeholders to be rendered in the editor thereby improving the function of the WYSIWYG editor with the code during design-time.

Regarding Dependent claim 8, which depends on claim 7, Yu discloses wherein the added code comprises client-side scripting that enables addition of a content component to a content container in the portal page using a drag-and-drop action (paragraphs 13 & 14).

Regarding Dependent claim 9, which depends on claim 6, Yu discloses wherein the placeholder comprises a custom Java Server Page tag, said translating the placeholder during design-time comprises invoking a design-time Java Server Page tag handler corresponding to the custom Java Server Page tag, and said translating the placeholder during run-time comprises invoking a run-time Java Server Page tag handler corresponding to the custom Java Server Page tag (paragraphs 13 & 14, wherein design-time the page includes JSP tags & a placeholder as described in paragraph 44. Further the previewing includes translating the placeholder from scripts during run-time and includes tag handlers to be able to display the dynamic content). Yu doesn't explicitly describe the rendering of the content based on the scripts in WYSIWYG editor that would include static content. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the rendering of the scripts to only show static content within the WYSIWYG editor. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow some static content associated with the script and placeholders to be rendered in the editor thereby improving the function of the WYSIWYG editor with the code during design-time.

Regarding Independent claim 10, Yu discloses a machine-implemented method comprising: selectively interpreting a portal page template based on a mode of operation, wherein the interpreting results in presentation of a design-time application operable to edit the portal page template if the mode of operation is design-time, and the interpreting results in presentation of a run-time application operable to interact with portal dynamic content if the mode of operation is run-time (paragraph 13 & 16, wherein the design-time translator includes the WYSIWYG HTML editor pertaining to the graphical layouts that include page elements. Wherein the run-time translator is when the page is previewed without any editor and allows the scripts to be viewed). Yu describes during run-time previewing of the script, however the components are obtained based on a predetermined set of rules therefore avoiding accessing the components from a server. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that the components pertaining to scripts are normally extracted from servers. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow access of dynamic content from multiple server locations and avoiding querying instructions in the local machine for handling the scripts thereby improving the performance of local machines rendering the scripts during run-time.

Regarding Dependent claim 11, which depends on claim 10, the claim describes a method that contains the same limitations as claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding Dependent claim 12, which depends on claim 11, Yu discloses wherein said invoking the design-time translator further results in client-side-scripting components being included in the representation to form at least part of the design-time application and enable adding a content component to a content container in the portal page template using a drag-and-drop action (paragraphs 13 & 14, wherein a placeholder represents the scripts for the dynamic content in the WYSIWYG editor during design-time). Yu doesn't explicitly describe the rendering of the content based on the scripts in WYSIWYG editor that would include static content. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the rendering of the scripts to only show static content within the WYSIWYG editor. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow some static content associated with the script and placeholders to be rendered in the editor thereby improving the function of the WYSIWYG editor with the code during design-time.

Regarding Dependent claim 13, which depends on claim 11, the claim describes a method that contains the same limitations as claim 5 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding Independent claim 14, the claim describes an article that contains the same limitations as claim 10 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding Dependent claim 15, which depends on claim 14, the claim describes an article that contains the same limitations as claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding Dependent claim 16, which depends on claim 15, the claim describes an article that contains the same limitations as claim 12 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding Dependent claim 17, which depends on claim 15, the claim describes an article that contains the same limitations as claim 5 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding Independent claim 18, Yu discloses a portal system comprising:

- A WYSIWYG portal layout editor that uses a selectively interpreted portal page template to reveal a WYSIWYG layout context for portal dynamic content without obtaining the portal dynamic content (paragraph 13 & 16, wherein the design-time translator includes the WYSIWYG HTML editor pertaining to the graphical layouts that include page elements);
- A first tag handler implementing a first custom action for a custom tag during portal design-time, wherein the WYSIWYG portal layout editor uses the first tag handler with the selectively interpreted portal page template to facilitate editing of the selectively interpreted portal page template (paragraphs 13 & 14, wherein a placeholder represents the scripts for the dynamic content in the WYSIWYG editor during design-time. Further at design-time the page includes JSP tags & a placeholder as described in paragraph 44);
- A second tag handler implementing a second custom action for the custom tag during portal run-time, wherein the portal system uses the second tag handler during portal run-time to obtain and reveal the portal dynamic content (paragraphs 13 & 14, wherein the previewing includes translating the placeholder from scripts during run-time and includes tag handlers to be able to display the dynamic content). Yu doesn't explicitly describe the rendering of the content based on the scripts in WYSIWYG editor that would include static content. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the rendering of the scripts to only show static content within the WYSIWYG editor. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow some static content associated with the script and placeholders to be rendered in the editor thereby improving the function of the WYSIWYG editor with the code during design-time.

Regarding Dependent claim 19, which depends on claim 18, Yu discloses wherein the first tag handler interprets the portal page template by including client-side scripting that enables addition of a content component to a content container in the portal page template using a drag-and-drop action (paragraphs 13 & 14, wherein a placeholder represents the scripts for the dynamic content in the WYSIWYG editor during design-time. Further at design-time the page includes JSP tags & a placeholder as described in paragraph 44). Yu doesn't explicitly describe the rendering of the content based on the scripts in WYSIWYG editor that would include static content. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the rendering of the scripts to only show static content within the WYSIWYG editor. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow some static content associated with the script and placeholders to be rendered in the editor thereby improving the function of the WYSIWYG editor with the code during design-time.

Regarding Dependent claim 20, which depends on claim 18, the claim describes a system that contains the same limitations as claim 5 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding Independent claim 21, Yu discloses a system comprising: means for building a portal layout template that governs generation of a portal presentation having dynamic run-time content, wherein the means for building includes means for revealing the portal presentation as governed by the layout template during design of the layout template, without running the dynamic run-time content (paragraph 13 & 16, wherein the design-time translator includes the WYSIWYG HTML editor pertaining to the graphical layouts that include page elements. Wherein the run-time translator is when the page is previewed without any editor and allows the scripts to be viewed). Yu doesn't explicitly describe the rendering of the content based on the scripts in WYSIWYG editor that would include static content. However at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the rendering of the scripts to only show static content within the WYSIWYG editor. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow some static content associated with the script and placeholders to be rendered in the editor thereby improving the function of the WYSIWYG editor with the code during design-time.

Regarding Dependent claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Yu discloses wherein the means for revealing the portal presentation includes means for facilitating client-side editing of the portal layout template (paragraph 13 & 16, wherein the design-time translator includes the WYSIWYG HTML editor pertaining to the graphical layouts that include client-side editing).

Regarding Dependent claim 23, which depends on claim 1, Yu discloses wherein the during design-time comprises a period during which editing for the page is supported and the during run-time comprises a period during which editing for the page is supported and the during run-time comprises a period during which editing of the page is not supported (paragraph 13 & 16, wherein the WYSIWYG editor is design-time editing and the previewing that runs the dynamic scripts is run-time which supports no editing).

Regarding Dependent claim 24, which depends on claim 1, Yu discloses wherein the design-time translator is part of a WYSIWYG layout editor, and the run-time translator is part of the run-time system that supports

presenting the page without supporting editing of the page (paragraph 13 & 16, wherein the WYSIWYG editor is design-time editing and the previewing that runs the dynamic scripts is run-time which supports no editing).

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed September 27. 2006 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejections.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
January 6, 2007

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER